# KING COUNTY SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE April 16, 2004 Unapproved DRAFT Meeting Notes

Members in Attendance

Carolyn Armanini William Beck Bob Beckwith Don Freas Steve Goldstein Jerry Hardebeck

Theresa Jennings Kevin Kiernan Tami Litras Diane Yates Nels Johnson

Others in Attendance

Mark Buscher

Mark Hooper Ray Schlienz Shirley Shimada Joe Tessier

### **Action Items**

Lines 8-9: Motion approving February 2004 minutes passed unanimously

Line 10: Agenda addition

Lines 81-82: Decision to cancel retreat planned for May and to have a regular meeting

Lines 85-90: Suggested agenda items for the May meeting

Lines 107-108: Cedar Groves Compost selected for annual July tour

## 1 Call to Order

2 Vice-Chair Hooper called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

3

#### 4 Introductions

5 SWAC members and others in attendance introduced themselves.

6

## 7 Approval of Minutes and Review of Agenda

- 8 SWAC member Shirley Shimada moved approval of the March 2004 minutes.
- 9 The motion passed unanimously.
- 10 Agenda addition: Mark Buscher update on the Waste to Energy presentation to cities.

11

#### 12 **Subcommittee Reports**

#### 13 Facilities and Operations Subcommittee

14 No report, April meeting was cancelled.

15

16

### WRR Subcommittee

- 18 Brownfields and Contaminated Site remediation Program:
- 19 Lucy Auster, Division staff, gave a presentation on the King County/City of Seattle Brownfields
- 20 program. The purpose of the program is to provide technical and financial assistance to
- 21 qualified private individuals and businesses, non-profit organizations and municipalities within
- 22 King County to assess and clean up contaminated brownfield sites. The U.S. Environmental
- 23 Protection Agency (EPA) defines a brownfield site as "real property, the expansion,
- 24 redevelopment, or reuse of which may be complicated by the presence or potential presence of a
- 25 hazardous substance, pollutant or contaminant." Brownfields do not include sites that have been
- 26 listed by EPA as Superfund sites. Except for Auster's staff time, the program is completely
- 27 funded by U.S. EPA. The program has three components: technical assistance, grants and
- 28 loans.

17

- 29 <u>Technical Assistance</u> Environmental Extension Service (EES) is provided by the non-profit
- 30 Environmental Coalition of South Seattle (ECOSS) via County contract. Assistance includes
- 31 research into past and present uses of sites; site visits to determine the likely extent of
- 32 contamination; review of existing environmental studies; help in navigating the regulatory and
- 33 technical requirements for the assessment/cleanup process; and help developing potential
- 34 cleanup options.
- 35 Grants EPA provides municipalities with funding for brownfields' assessment and cleanup
- 36 options.
- 37 Loans The Brownfields' Cleanup Revolving Loan Fund (BCRLF) provides below market-
- interest rates to eligible groups to finance site cleanup.
- 39 Success Stories The EES contacted 1,662 businesses between 1999 2003; assessing over
- 40 253 acres. Two striking successes of the program are: North Coast site and Rainier Court.
- 41 For additional information about the brownfields program, contact Lucy Auster by phone at
- 42 206-296-8476 or by e-mail at lucy.auster@metrokc.gov.
- 43
- 44 Factoria Household Hazardous Waste Facility:
- 45 Jim Neely, Division staff, provided a briefing on the status of the household hazardous waste
- 46 (HHW) facility at Factoria Transfer Station. Since 1989, the Wastemobile has provided King
- 47 County households (excluding Seattle) with free HHW collection options.
- In June 2000, a service-level study funded by the Local Hazardous Waste Management Program
- 49 of King County (LHWMP) recommended establishing a pilot fixed facility on the Eastside in
- order to provide better collection options. The Factoria Transfer Station site was selected for

51	the pilot.	The capital	budget for the	he facility v	was a very	modest \$102,000,	while the major	ity of
----	------------	-------------	----------------	---------------	------------	-------------------	-----------------	--------

- such facilities are over \$500,000. However, the project planning team developed a design for
- 53 the facility that met the budget constraints through cost-saving features such as portable,
- 54 prepackaged buildings, portable eye-washes, and a dry sump for the unloading area.
- In 2003, 12,267 customers were served, bringing 463 tons of HHW. Ninety-nine percent of
- customers rated service as either Excellent (84%) or Good (15%). Eighty-eight percent rated
- driving distance to the facility as either Excellent (53%) or Good (35%). The cost per ton and
- 58 per vehicle in 2003 was lower for Factoria than for the Wastemobile, and King County received
- 59 a 2003 Achievement Award from the National Association of Counties for the Factoria facility.
- The Factoria project planning team has recommended to LHWMP that the Factoria site be made
- permanent, and that another fixed facility be considered in South King County in the 2006
- budget process.

63 64

#### **Waste to Energy Presentation to Cities:**

- Mark Buscher, Lead Planner, briefed SWAC on a presentation he attended by Waste Recovery
- 66 Seattle, Inc. (WRSI) to the Suburban Cities Association. Waste Recovery Seattle, Inc., a small
- 67 company with a staff of two Philipp Schmidt-Pathmann, President and Douglas Gilmore,
- Associate presented its proposal for burning municipal (urban) solid waste (MSW) to generate
- 69 power. Buscher distributed hard copies of the company's PowerPoint presentation "Waste-to-
- 70 Energy (WTE) vs. Rail-to-Landfill." Although this method of disposal works in Europe,
- 71 WRSI is unfamiliar with solid waste handling practices in this region. Buscher provided the
- company with copies of the adopted Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan, the
- 73 Division's Business Plan, and the latest regional Waste Characterization Study.

74

- 75 Buscher told WSRI that they could choose to submit a detailed proposal/business plan on how
- their technology would work in this region when the Solid Waste Management Plan is next
- updated in 2005. He also suggested that WRSI talk to local energy and solid waste management
- 78 companies.

79

80

#### **SWAC Retreat – Discussion of retreat purpose and agenda:**

- 81 After discussing agenda items for a retreat, **SWAC unanimously decided not to have a retreat**
- in May. There will be a regular SWAC meeting on May 21, 2004. Shirley Shimada requested
- 83 the 8<sup>th</sup> floor conference room be reserved.

84

85	Suggested agenda items for the May meeting include:			
86	1) Conflict of Interest,			
87	2) SWAC structure.			
88	Steve Goldstein said he participated in the public process for the public art at $1^{\text{st}}$ Northeast			
89	and is concerned about the design. He requested that a presentation on the proposed art			
90	be added to SWAC's May meeting agenda. Members agreed. Staff will contact the			
91	Cultural Development Authority to schedule.			
92				
93	Kiernan commented that the artist has presented her ideas to the Solid Waste Division			
94	Management Team (SWDMT). SWDMT was happy with her concepts.			
95				
96	SWAC member Bill Beck said that his wife loves to go to the Enumclaw Transfer Station with			
97	him just to see the art.			
98				
99	SWAC Tours – Discussion of possible tour sites:			
100	Choices for SWAC's annual field trip on July 16, 2004:			
101	1) Rabanco Intermodal			
102	2) Northwest Container Hauling			
103	3) Cedar Groves Compost facility			
104	4) Waste Management's Woodinville recycling facility			
105	5) Household Hazardous Waste Locker at the Factoria Transfer Station			
106	6) Brownfield site			
107	Members expressed interest in several of the tour possibilities but decided to tour Cedar			
108	Groves since the company has implemented new technology. Jerry Hardebeck said members			
109	could tour Waste Management's new recycling facility at anytime.			
110				
111	SWD Changes Update			
112	Theresa Jennings told SWAC that on March 26th, there was informational picketing at transfer			
113	stations by UPS truck drivers represented by Teamsters Local 174. Negotiations with Local			
114	174 took place on March 26 <sup>th</sup> and, on the morning of March 27t <sup>h</sup> , the parties reached			
115	agreement. The agreement was ratified by the members on April 4th. On March 29 <sup>th</sup> , Local			
116	174's new work schedules went into effect.			
117				
118	On March 31st, Rabanco filed a lawsuit against the Solid Waste Division on three issues:			

119	1) legality of the rent;					
120	2) regional direct rate increase;					
121	3) flow control in unincorporated areas.					
122	The rent issue questions whether King County has a right to charge the Solid Waste Division					
123	rent for the use of the Cedar Hills Landfill. The flow control issue centers on the state law					
124	concerning consolidated G certificates that cross county lines.					
125						
126	On April 1, Judge Doerty placed a 60 day temporary restraining order on the regional direct rate					
127	increase. In a subsequent hearing, Judge Doerty reduced the restraining order to 30 days.					
128						
129	On May 4th, there will be another hearing to determine if the restraining order will stay in place					
130						
131	SWAC member Joe Tessier asked if the transfer station scheduled hours changes would be					
132	implemented.					
133						
134	Jennings responded that the 2 <sup>nd</sup> shift is operating at the Bow Lake Transfer Station. Hours'					
135	changes at urban facilities that were scheduled to go into effect on June 1st won't be					
136	implemented until June 14th. The hours' changes at the Enumclaw and Vashon transfer stations					
137	did take place on April 1st.					
138						
139	Tessier asked what the impact to the Division will be if the restraining order stays in place until					
140	the trial.					
141						
142	Jennings responded that this is what the business plan envisioned - that the haulers would					
143	continue to use the Cedar Hills Landfill.					
144						
145	The Division is working with the cities on a number of issues, including the waste export plan					
146	and a strategy to address the Eastside Transfer Stations (Houghton and Factoria). Several cities					
147	have also expressed interest in renegotiating their ILAs.					
148						
149	<u>Transfer Station Updates – 1<sup>st</sup> NE and Bow Lake</u>					
150	Engineering Services Manager Kevin Kiernan gave an update on the 1st NE Transfer Station					
151	Improvement Project. A community meeting is scheduled for May 11th to present the design for					
152	the station, which is at 30 percent completion.					

153	Planning has started on the Bow Lake Transfer Station Facility Master Plan. Public notice has
154	been sent out and the Division is soliciting input. There will be a different public process for
155	Bow Lake since it is not in a residential neighborhood.
156	
157	Employee Morale
158	Jennings stated that employee morale seems improved over the past few weeks.
159	
160	<u>Adjournment</u>
161	The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 a.m.
162	
163	Submitted by:
164	Tami Litras, Solid Waste Division staff